



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The author is skeptical concerning world organization, believing in the improvement of existing constitutional systems, and in coöperation among states rather than in schemes of interstate government. In the preface, however, he points out that the entrance of the United States into the war and the revolution in autocratic Russia have removed the chief obstacles to constructive proposals for political world unity.

Chapters v and vi discuss education and its effect on social and national public opinion. Chapters vii and viii are brief but brilliant surveys of the evolution of government and of industry. Chapters ix to xii deal with various aspects of reconstruction in industry and favor the policy of joint control as adopted recently in the report of the Whitely committee. The final chapters point out the undesirable extremes of Prussianism, desiring world control under autocratic force, and of Bolshevism, creating revolutionary doctrines growing out of oppression and fanaticism. In contrast the author suggests the liberal ideal of a commonwealth, based on intelligent and coöperative organization. In spite of a considerable amount of repetition, the volume is an aid to clear thinking on the confused problems of nationality, world organization, social education and industrial control.

RAYMOND GARFIELD GETTELL.

*Amherst College.*

*Ireland: A Study in Nationalism.* By FRANCIS HACKETT.  
(New York: B. W. Huebsch. 1918.)

This volume is one of the best studies made about Ireland for some time, though scarcely worthy to rank with Paul-Dubois's *L'Irlande Contemporaine*, as one critic has declared. It is written with great charm, and is one of the most interesting contributions upon an important contemporary question; though the vigor and clearness of the composition accompany a journalistic style which at times degenerates into bad taste and careless expression.

The book contains perhaps the best account of present Irish conditions and some aspects of the Irish question now existing. It is not so much a critical and historical treatment of Irish matters as a vivid and even passionate discussion of Irish social and economic conditions, and herein are the chief value and interest of the work. Nowhere is there better description of Irish religious affairs, the influence of the priests, and the defects of Irish education; while the author's opinions

as to poverty and economic factors, if apparently inspired more by the reformer's zeal to make things better than the critic's appreciation of all elements of the situation, are very suggestive. For an understanding of Ireland as it is and as it has been for some years past, the book is to be highly recommended, though it must be supplemented and corrected by reading of others.

The work has, however, serious faults, and affords very inadequate material for correct and just judgment of the whole Irish question. This problem is not, as many of the ill-informed and aggressive seem to think, one which affects Ireland alone, nor is it one which can be dealt with merely in terms of the present and a future hoped for and conjectured. Great Britain has also to be considered; while the matter can neither be rightly understood nor properly dealt with unless there be also considerable understanding of the past and of how things came to be. It is precisely in respect of these considerations that the volume is least good. The author writes as a worker in some social survey or as a journalist, rather than as an historical investigator; and while he does not, to do him justice, view the Celtic past through the haze of sentimental ignorance and biased erudition of Mrs. Green, yet there is far too little in the book dealing with what has been, as properly to explain the things of the present which he denounces or would so surely and easily reform. Nor has he done justice either to himself or his subject in writing an entire chapter upon the earlier history of Ireland in the form of a modern parable about fishing and cutting of bait. The gravest defect of all is the little consideration given to the position of Britain at present. The geographical and strategic situation of Ireland with respect to the neighboring island, which has concerned leaders and statesmen for some hundreds of years, and is usually recognized by critics as a fundamental element in the problem of Irish independence or connection with England, he dismisses immediately by reprehending the maxims which von Bissing laid down for the German domination of Belgium. Indeed, in several instances he disposes of unpleasant considerations or considerable objections by declaring that they savor of the Prussian spirit. Occasionally the handling of evidence is clumsy if not unfair.

The author's main conclusions seem to be sound: there are things in Ireland wrong which must be amended; Irishmen should not seek complete separation, but accept the status of a self-governing dominion in the British commonwealth. Perhaps the better conditions of an era which we see now beginning may enable British statesmen and the

leaders of the new nationalism in Ireland to agree to bring these things about.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

*University of Michigan.*

*Racial Factors in Democracy.* By PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS.  
(Boston: Marshall Jones Company. 1918. Pp. x, 278.)

Mr. Means devotes the first half of his book to a cursory survey of the cultural history of mankind from the *pithecanthropus erectus* down to relatively late American civilizations. However, very little use is made of this long introduction in the brief discussion of the laws of cultural growth and their relation to democratic development, or in the idealistic sketch of a democratic government based on merit. The last third of the book, save for a brief statement of conclusions, is occupied with an exposition of the anthropological aspects of certain modern colonies, and the extent to which race-appreciation has been applied in their government.

At a time of social turmoil and political uncertainty, when radical world reorganization is a foregone conclusion, the friends of democracy should gratefully welcome light and assistance from unwonted sources. Mr. Means has tried to make anthropology the hand-maiden of political science, unfortunately with only moderate success, both because of lack of detail and because of imperfect logic. The liberal thought of Western civilization already tends to believe in his thesis; but neither is that belief a result of anthropological considerations, nor is it likely that it will be strengthened thereby to any extent, if Mr. Means has made the most of that line of argument.

Essentially his argument is that because the historical development of races and cultures has been marked by extensive borrowing, conscious and unconscious, we must and will, if democratic world organization is to be secured, consciously adopt, systematically and on a large scale, a policy of race-appreciation and interdependence, acknowledging the superiority of other cultures in certain particulars, and eclectically bending the best of their institutions into our own racial life. The conclusion hardly seems inevitable. Certain it is that if the immediate future is to be characterized by a more generous race-appreciation (as it must be if the league of nations is not to be a mere paper mockery), the reason and motive are found in the obvious failure of